



3

of 25

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR

W.P. No. 67 of 1996

Petitioner:

Shantilal Yadav,
S/o of Terasram Yadav,
Aged about 31 years,
Ex-Messenger-cum-Sweeper,
Bilaspur-Raipur Kshetriya
Gramin Bank,
Branch Masturi,
District Bilaspur, M.P.

Versus

Respondents:

1. Bilaspur-Raipur Kshetriya
Gramin Bank,
Through its Chairman,
Head Office Dayalband,
Bilaspur,
District Bilaspur, M.P.
Pin 495 001.
2. The Chairman,
Bilaspur-Raipur Kshetriya
Gramin Bank,
Head Office Dayalband,
Bilaspur,
District Bilaspur, M.P.
Pin 495 001.



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA


HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR**Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.****W. P. No. 67 OF 1996**

Petitioner : Shantilal Yadav
Versus
Respondents : Bilaspur-Raipur Kshetriya Gramin
Ban¹ and another

Shri Vinod Deshmukh, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Kashif Shakeel, counsel for the respondents.

ORAL ORDER**(20th February, 2006)**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner has filed an appeal on 5.6.1995 (Annexure P-9). Learned counsel further submits that the respondents be directed to consider his appeal/application, dated 5.6.1995 and decide the same expeditiously.
2. Shri Kashif Shakeel, appearing for respondents No. 1 and 2, states that the petitioner has not filed an appeal as required under law, but a simple application (Annexure P-9) before the Chairman-respondent No.2.
3. This application is not in proper form and not addressed to the Board of Directors. Be that as it may, the respondents should not insist upon such a technicality from the delinquent employee for filing appeal. The application filed by the petitioner be treated as an appeal.
4. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to treat this application as an appeal and place before the appropriate authority for consideration and decision.



5. The concerned authorities are directed to consider this application as appeal within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.
6. In view of the above, this petition is disposed of reserving the liberty to the petitioner to file fresh petition, if any cause of action arises after disposal of the appeal. No order as to costs.
7. Interim order dated 11.1.96, which was continued on 16.8.96 will continue till the disposal of the appeal by the concerned authority.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Court